

## REMARKS

By the present Amendment, the Abstract has been rewritten to address the Examiner's objections and make other improvements.

Also by the present Amendment, the claims have been amended to overcome the rejection based on indefiniteness. More specifically, the alternate shapes have been deleted from claim 1 and placed in respective new claims, claims 5 and 6. In addition, the actor is more clearly positively claimed.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Mock is respectfully requested. One of ordinary skill looking at the Mock reference, which is designed for grating coconut meat off the internal surface of the shell of the coconut, would not find it suitable for releasing and delivering table salt from a block of table salt. For one thing, one of ordinary skill would be concerned about injury as a result of the block of table salt suddenly disintegrating under the action of the grater of Mock and the hand of the user then coming into contact with the spinning blades of the grater. Coconuts differ from blocks of salt in that the meat of the coconut is more easily grated than the shell of the coconut, so that the shell acts as a safety shield for the hand of the user with respect to the spinning blades of the grater. Blocks of salt are more homogeneous. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to use the grater of Mock with a block of salt.

Furthermore, with the block of salt of the present invention, the material that is being released and delivered is the material that is the case for the material. In contrast, with the coconut of Mock, the coconut meat is being grated, but the coconut meat is not the case for the coconut. Instead, the coconut shell is the case.

Moreover, claim 1, as amended, recites that the actor delivers desired amounts of salt for use. In contrast, the grater of Mock does not deliver coconut for use. Instead, the grater of Mock only removes the meat from the shell of the coconut in a grated condition. Mock does not disclose that the grater delivers the coconut meat for use. From the disclosure of Mock, it is clear that the grated coconut meat remains in the shell, apparently to be removed from the shell in an undisclosed manner.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2 and 4 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Bigelow is also respectfully requested for at least the reason that claims 2 and 4 depend on claim 1, and Bigelow does not provide a disclosure that overcomes the above-described deficiencies of the Mock reference with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0562.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-14-07

  
John P. Shannon  
Registration No. 29,276

**Merek, Blackmon & Voorhees, LLC**  
673 South Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-5633  
**Customer No. 48234**



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service

with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 6-14-07.

John P. Shannon  
John P. Shannon